



Applicant(s)	Jack Linn et al.	RESPONSE UNDER 37 C.F.R. § 1.116 RECEIVED DEC 16 2002 PATENT & TRADEMARK CENTER 2800
Serial No.	09/846,795	
Filing Date	May 1, 2001	
Group Art Unit	2829	
Examiner Name	Ashok K. Sarkar	
Attorney Docket No.	125.013US02	
Title: BONDED SUBSTRATE FOR AN INTEGRATED CIRCUIT CONTAINING A PLANAR INTRINSIC GETTERING ZONE		

Commissioner for Patents
Washington, D.C. 20231

Applicant has reviewed the Final Office Action mailed on October 16, 2002. Applicant respectfully requests the Examiner reconsider the rejections in an Advisory Action.

IN THE CLAIMS

Cancel non-elected claims 49-56. Applicant retains the right to reintroduce them in a divisional application.

REMARKS

Claims 49-56 have been canceled. Claims 24-44 and 46-48 are now pending in this application.

Claims 24-29, 31, 35-38, 40, 41 and 46-48 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 102(e) as being anticipated by Henley, US 6,083,324. Even though, Applicant responded to the rejections in the First Office Action mailed May 20, 2002, the Examiner recited the same rejections without providing an explanation why the Applicant's amendments and arguments failed to patentably distinguish the present application from the Henley reference. The only addition statement made by the Examiner was that the Henley reference "teaches gettering zone of substantially pure semiconductor material in column 3, lines 3-8."

Accordingly, Applicant maintains that the arguments set forth in the Amendment and Response filed on August 20, 2002 patentably distinguish the claims of the present application from the Henley reference. In addition, a 102 rejection requires that the art reference teach every aspect of the claimed invention. One aspect not taught or disclosed in the Henley reference that

#12/Amend D(NE)
1-7-03

C. Moore

DO NOT
enter
A/C's
1/14/03